INDEX

Academic program cost-effectiveness measures, 11
Accountability: active listening and, 6, 9; assessing performance and, 6, 9; clarifying goals and, 6, 9; to constituent groups, 6–7; costs of, 7; definition of, 6–7; financial statement audits and, 7–8; initiatives for, 31; institutional culture and, 9; leadership/governance and, 9; quality and efficiency and, 8; stewardship and, 6; strategic thinking and, 6, 9; student learning and, 24–26; techniques for defining, 6, 8–9. *See also* Middle States Commission on Higher Education, assessment standards of; University System of Maryland, institutional transformation at (case example)
Administrative cost reductions, examples of, 9–10
Application service provider (ASP), 113–114
Assessment: of institutional effectiveness, 16–24; of student learning, 16, 24–26. *See also* Middle States Commission on Higher Education, assessment standards of
Attainment: higher education response to, 30–31; increased expectations of, 29–30; quality issues in increasing, 30
Attainment/quality/productivity, in higher education. *See* Institutional quality/effectiveness improvement
Audience, targeting of, 92–93

Baldridge National Quality Award Program, 63, 73
Barak, R. J., 51, 53, 61
Baum, S., 31, 38, 78, 81, 85
Beebower, G., 102, 110
Berdahl, R. O, 29, 38
Blumenstyk, G., 121, 125, 128
Branding, institutional characteristics and, 93
Breneman, D. W., 121, 128
Brinson, G., 102, 110
Brown, J. S., 114, 120
Business Higher Education Forum, 31, 38
Cabrini College (Philadelphia), information technology infrastructure at (case example): academic IT collaborations and, 115–116; background, 112–113; financial benefits and, 118–110; improvements in, 117–118; institutional culture differences and, 116–117; as model for other academic–IT alliances, 118, 120; partnership with Drexel University and, 113–120
Carnevale, D., 124, 128
Center for Academic Transformation, 31
Changing Directions project, 31
Chronicle of Higher Education, 127, 128
College Board, 78, 81, 82, 85
Colvin, G., 30, 38
Commonfund, 105, 107, 110
Competition: models of, 97; quality and, 31; among providers, 5
Constituencies, 6–7. *See also* Shareholders
Customers: discriminatory knowledge and expectations of, 5

Dakota roundtable initiative, 35–37
Deil-Amen, R., 127, 128
Dickinson College, tuition/aid policies of (case example): background, 87; benchmarking data and, 90; program branding and, 93; data analysis and, 89–90; data on student characteristics and, 88; decision support and, 88–91; identifying the audience and, 92–93; institutional vision/mission and, 97; logistical regression enrollment projection model and, 88–89, 95; marketing the program and, 91–92; organizational vision and, 91; pricing and aid strategies and, 93–96; program results and, 96–98; Sinha tutorial and, 89; strategic planning and, 96–97; student life surveys and, 90; Tuition Plan II and, 96
Dowd, A. C., 52, 61
Dressel, P., 15, 18
Drucker, P., 30, 38

Edler, F. H. W., 13
Education Commission of the States, 126, 127, 128
Efficiency and Effectiveness Program Review Model (EEPRM): applications of, 54; benefits of, 57; efficiency/effectiveness measures and, 59, 61; elements of, 57; information matrix and, 54, 57; institutional outcomes and, 53; performance variables and, 54; purpose of, 59; tenets of, 54
Efficiency, definition of, 6
Efficiency improvement: academic program cost-effectiveness and, 11; active listening and, 6, 9; administrative cost reductions and, 9–10; applications of, 9–12; assessing performance and, 6, 9; clarifying goals and, 6, 9; Effectiveness and Efficiency Initiative (University System of Maryland) and, 44–47; institutional culture and, 9; leadership/governance and, 9; operations and, 6; process improvements and, 10; retention initiatives and, 10–11; strategic thinking and, 6, 9; student success measures and, 11; targeted aid and, 12; techniques for defining, 6, 8–9. *See also* Efficiency and Effectiveness Program Review Model (EEPRM); Mohave Community College, institutional performance improvement and (case example); Productivity improvement
Endowments: advantages of, 99, 105–106; asset allocation and, 102–104; current spending vs. accumulation and, 108–109; determining expenditures and, 106–107; institutional quality and, 109; operating budget and, 104–106; return on investment and, 100–104; size of, 109; sources of growth of, 101–102; spending policies and, 107–109; statistics on, 99–100; uses of, 104–107
Ewell, P. T., 52, 61

Farnsworth, K. A., 127, 128
Financial aid: ability- vs. willingness-to-pay objective and, 83; analytical approaches to policies on, 82–85; changing goals of, 75; distribution of aid and, 78, 80; equity vs. efficiency and, 84–85; expenditure vs. discount view and, 83–84; historic role of, 75; student impact of changing policies on, 80–82; increasing financing gap and, 76; long-term perspective and, 82–83; merit-based vs. need-based, 44; Oklahoma Promise scholarship program and, 34–35; political and economic agenda and, 75; short-term vs. long-term perspective and, 82. *See also* Dickinson College, tuition/aid policies of (case example)
Financial statement audits, institutional accountability and, 7–8
Floyd, C. E., 121, 127, 128
For-profit colleges: ability to change of, 125; accountability framework for, 122–123; advantages of, 122; challenges for, 126–127; classification elements for, 127; diversity patterns at, 124; economic opportunities and, 124; enrollment/degree patterns at, 123–124; enterprise institutions and, 122; expanding mission of, 123; federal legislation and, 125–126; financial aid and, 126; financing of, 125; fraud at, 123; future study of, 127; health sciences and, 123; increase in, 121, 124; lessons for community colleges from, 127; multicampus corporations and, 122; operating norms of, 122; student loan default rate and, 123; studies on, 121; types of, 122
Foster, A., 124, 128
Franchising, 133
Friedman, T., 30, 38
Furst-Bowe, J., 13

Ginder, S. A., 124, 128
Globalization, and higher education: cost-price squeeze and, 135; costs of global programs and, 137–138; examples of, 132–133; financial stakeholders and, 134; franchising and, 133, 137; GATT talks and, 134; global education goals and, 134; hub-and-spoke distribution model and, 132; institutional mission and, 135; international students and, 134; international views of higher education and, 134; loss of tuition and, 137–148; outsourced modularization and, 132; place-based institutional identity and, 133; quality control and, 136, 138; rationale for cross-border activities and, 136; reasons for small impact on, 133–134; research funding and, 135–136; risks of global approaches and, 137; science shift to Asia and, 135; state support

and, 135; twinning and, 132–133; economic impact of, 131; internationalization and, 131–133; production/distribution process of, 131–132
Globalization model, of distribution, 132

Hagel, J., 114, 120
Hanson, D. J., 13
Henry, T. C., 53, 61
Hentschke, G. A., 121, 123, 124, 125, 129
Hersh, R. H., 13
Higher education. *See* For-profit colleges; Globalization, and higher education; Higher education market; Institutional quality/effectiveness improvement; *and by specific institution/topic*
Higher Education Act, 15
Higher education market: competitive environment of, 5; complexities of, 5–6; customer expectations/knowledgeability and, 5; quality and advancement in, 8; revenues and, 6; shareholder goals in, 6. *See also* Competition
Hood, L. R., 102, 110
Hub-and-spoke model, of distribution, 132

Information technology (IT): application service providers and, 113–114; Internet provision of, 114; financing difficulties for, 111–112; provider arrangements and, 113–114. *See also* Cabrini College (Philadelphia), information technology infrastructure at (case example)
Institutional effectiveness, assessment of. *See* Assessment; Middle States Commission on Higher Education, assessment standards of
Institutional quality/effectiveness improvement: accountability initiatives and, 31; broad ownership and continuity and, 37–38; commitment and shared rewards and, 38; competition and, 31, 37; Dakota roundtable initiative and, 35–37; federal education initiatives and, 111; higher education reform and, 30–31; information system and, 37; inputs and, 31; Kentucky Postsecondary Improvement Act, House Bill 1 and, 32–33; knowledge economy and, 30; leadership and, 37; monitoring and maintenance and, 38; Oklahoma Promise scholarship program and, 34–35; P*Q*P initiative (Illinois) and, 31–32; program review/management and, 51–52; quality issues and, 30; requirements for sustaining progress on, 37; state policy initiatives (examples) and, 31–37; strategic planning and, 31, 37–38; transformation of expectations and, 30; trans-institutional perspective and, 37; tuition discounting and, 31. *See also* Accountability; Attainment; Dickinson College, tuition/aid policies (case example); Efficiency improvement; Mohave Community College, institutional performance improvement and (case example); Productivity improvement; Quality improvement; University of Wisconsin-Stout, institutional quality/effectiveness improvement at (case example); University System of Maryland, institutional transformation at (case example)

Jansen, P., 108–109, 110
JBL Associates, 126, 128

Kaplan University, 123, 128
Keller, G., 29, 38
Kelly-Reid, J. E., 124, 128
Kentucky Postsecondary Improvement Act, House Bill 1, 32–33
Kinser, K., 121, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128
Knapp, L. G., 124, 128

Lapovsky, L., 31, 38, 78, 85, 90, 96, 98, 99, 110
Lingenfelter, P. E., 30, 38
Loomis Hubbell, L. W., 90, 96, 98

Mapping the Global Future, 135, 138
Marketing, in higher education, 91
Massa, R. J., 90, 96, 98
Mets, L. A., 51, 53, 61
Michael, S. O, 13
Middle States Commission on Higher Education, 15–17, 28
Middle States Commission on Higher Education, assessment standards of: accountability and, 27; compliance requirements and, 16; faculty teaching loads and, 21–23; follow-up and, 17; grading practices and, 15, 24; institutional mission and, 16; institutional outcome measures and, 23–24; planning and resource allocation and, 17, 19–21; student learning and, 16, 24–26; student learning assessment

measures and, 26–27; student opinion surveys and, 17–19
Miller, E., 124, 128
Mills, K., 52, 61
Mohave Community College, institutional performance improvement and (case example): accountability and, 61; background and challenges and, 52–53; Efficiency and Effectiveness Program Review Model (EEPRM) and, 53–57; findings, 57–58; measures, 58–59; rationale for implementing EEPRM and, 59, 61; recommendations, 58–59; research projects and, 53; resources and public demand, 52–53; results, 61
Mortenson, T., 81, 85

National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO), 13, 101, 110
National Center for Educational Statistics, 29
National Commission on Accountability in Higher Education, 51, 61
National Survey of Student Engagement, 73

Oklahoma Promise scholarship program, 34–35
O'Malley, M., 81, 85

P*Q*P initiative (Illinois), 31–32
Palmisano, S., 132, 138
Performance improvement: P*Q*P initiative (Illinois) and, 31–32. *See also* Mohave Community College, institutional performance improvement and (case example); Productivity improvement
Person, A. E., 127, 128
Pricing, of tuition, 96
Process improvements, examples of, 10
Productivity improvement: Effectiveness and Efficiency Initiative (University System of Maryland) and, 44–47; P*Q*P initiative (Illinois) and, 31–32. *See also* Efficiency improvement; Institutional transformation; Performance improvement; University System of Maryland, institutional transformation at (case example)
Program review: efficiency/effectiveness and, 52; institutional transformation and, 51; interface with institutional processes and, 51–52. *See also* Efficiency and Effectiveness Program Review Model (EEPRM)
Pusser, B., 121, 128

Quality: definition of, 6, 8; strategic thinking and, 6, 9; techniques for defining, 6, 8–9
Quality improvement: active listening and, 6, 9; advancement of market position and, 8; applications of, 9–12; assessing performance and, 6, 9; clarifying goals and, 6, 9; conflicting elements of, 8; educational experience and, 8; fiscal ability and, 8; institutional culture and, 9; institutional inputs and outputs and, 8; leadership/governance and, 9; P*Q*P initiative (Illinois) and, 31–32; process results and, 8. *See also* Institutional quality/effectiveness improvement; Mohave Community College, institutional performance improvement and (case example); University System of Maryland, institutional transformation at (case example)

Rawls, J., 84, 85
Rice, G. K., 13
Rogers, F., 102, 110
Rosenbaum, J. E., 13, 127, 128
Ruch, R. S., 126, 128

Sanders, K. R., 32, 38
Sevier, R. A., 91, 98
Shareholders: accountability and, 6–7; goals of, 6. *See also* Constitutencies
Sinha, K. W., 89, 98
Social norm initiatives, and institutional quality/efficiency, 12
South Dakota Board of Regents, 36, 37
State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO) 33, 38, 41
Strehle, G., 102, 110
Student learning, accountability and, 24–26
Student learning assessment measures 26–27. *See also* Assessment
Student success measures, and institutional quality/efficiency, 11

Targeted aid, and institutional efficiency/quality, 12
Taylor, D. C., 13
Tierney, W. G., 121, 123, 124, 125, 129

Tuition, pricing of, 96. *See also* Financial aid
Tuition discounting, 31, 83–84, 96
Turner, S. E., 121, 128
Twinning, 132–133

Uniform Prudent Management of Institutional Funds Act, 109, 110
University of Wisconsin-Stout, institutional quality/effectiveness improvement at (case example): background, 63; Curricular Incubation Center and, 71; e-Scholar program and, 71; leadership and, 64; meeting rules and, 68–69; participation/communication and, 64–65; performance indicators and, 69–72; planning readiness and, 63; planning/budget process and, 66–68; polytechnic designation and, 71–72; program outcomes and, 72; resource principles and, 69; stakeholder visioning sessions and, 68; strategic planning model and, 65–66; support structure and, 64; university priority template and, 69, 70 fig.
University System of Maryland (USM), 41
University System of Maryland, institutional transformation at (case example): administrative commitment and, 46; collective purchasing and, 45; condensed degree program and, 47; cost-effective activities and, 43–45; dual admission model and, 46–47; early college access and, 48; economic challenges and, 41–42; Effectiveness and Efficiency Initiative and, 44–47; fast-tracking students and, 48; growth institutions and, 45; initiative by individual institutions and, 45–46; need-based financial aid and, 44; next phase of E&E Initiative and, 47–48; performance measures and, 49; public attitude and, 42; revolutionary systemic change and, 42–43; steps to transformative change and, 45; student access and, 46; technology-based courses and, 48; time-to-degree and, 45–46
University System of North Dakota, 35, 36, 39
U.S. Census Bureau, 76, 85
U.S. Department of Education, 76, 80, 85
U.S. News & World Report, 99, 110

Vaughan, G. B., 53, 61

Ward, J., 52, 61
Wellman, J. V., 13
Wentz, M., 13
Wilson, H., 126, 128
Winston, G. C., 13
Winston, G., 31, 39

Zemsky, R., 13
Zumeta, W., 51, 53, 61